



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

author an untenable position, for many reasons; and we seem, therefore, shut up to the hypothesis of spirit communication, so far as the facts at hand are concerned.

That the investigations have been carried on with the utmost care, and with disinterested motives, seems beyond question. That Professor Hyslop's discussion is careful, moderate, and dispassionate is also obvious. The reader, of course, feels the grotesquely slender nature of such evidence, in relation to the tremendously important doctrine that rests upon it. But the scientist very properly ignores our feelings in the matter.

Issue must, however, be squarely taken with Dr. Hyslop when he denies the ability of philosophy to do anything in this field. It is quite true that philosophy is not able to prove the reality of a future life, if "proving" means demonstrating after the manner of mathematics. Philosophy does not prove things in this sense of the term, for it is precisely in those regions where such proof is impossible that philosophy finds her vocation. But philosophy has the right to ask what conception of man's destiny will most satisfactorily account for the facts of his nature as we know them. And, surely, if the nature of his knowledge as an activity of his intelligence, the aspirations of his heart, the ethical ideals which he sets before him, the moral imperatives which he lays upon himself, and the restless hunger of his being for a satisfaction never fully attained in any human life—if these things require the belief in human immortality in order to render them coherent and intelligible, then surely that belief is justified, and the future life proved in a deeper sense than demonstration.

On this account we seem to be on higher ground when, with Professor Münsterberg, we reason from the nature of man's true being to the conception of his immortality, than when, with Professor Hyslop, we seek in the sporadic communications of a trance medium some proof that deceased persons have not wholly ceased to be. By this remark we do not intend to discredit the work of science, but only to claim for philosophy the right to investigate the question in her own way.

FREDERICK TRACY.

THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO.

---

### THE INFLUENCE OF SCHLEIERMACHER ON MODERN THEOLOGY

Two recent publications illustrate the keen interest taken by German students of theology in the origin and import of Friedrich Schleiermacher's system of thought. E. R. Meyer<sup>1</sup> traces in minute detail the youthful

<sup>1</sup> *Schleiermachers und C. G. Brinkmanns Gang durch die Brüdergemeine*. Von E. R. Meyer. Leipzig: Friedrich, 1905. viii + 288 pages.

Schleiermacher's relations with the Moravian Brethren. In an estimate of the famous *Glaubenslehre* Carl Clemen<sup>2</sup> analyzes his doctrinal system and indicates how far later German theologians follow him. Meyer's book represents an immense amount of labor. He has ferreted out the history of Schleiermacher's family; the correspondence of the members of the family with one another and their friends; the accounts given in their letters and otherwise by Schleiermacher, Brinkmann, Fries, Garve, Hartley, Stähelin, Albertini, and other students in Moravian schools of the manner in which those institutions were conducted; the religious life that swelled and surged there; their own personal experiences while resident there, and their views of the manner in which their lives were affected thereby. It might be expected that the mass of material put together would prove confusing, or at least uninteresting, to a twentieth-century reader, but this is far from being the case. There is scarcely a dull page in the book. We find in it not only a narrative, such as can be found nowhere else in literature, of an extremely fertile period in the life of the famous German preacher and theologian, but also a satisfactory exposition of the religious beliefs and customs, and of the organizations of that wonderful band of people known by the name of Moravian Brethren. Under Meyer's guidance we trace the following outline:

From his earliest childhood Schleiermacher was nurtured in the piety of the Brethren of Herrnhut. Both his father (a Prussian army chaplain) and his mother were Moravians in sentiment, though members of the Reformed church, and they committed the education of their children to these people. When Friedrich was but a child at Gnadenfrei he became an earnest seeker for that experience of supernatural grace which they regarded as the essential fact of the Christian life; and later at Niesky, where he spent four years in their academy, he earnestly devoted himself to their religious ideas and practices, and, passing through the successive grades of admission to their society, advanced to full membership. The only stumbling block he seemed to meet was their Calvinistic doctrine, which, with all their pietism, they regarded as Christian truth. At times grave doubts troubled him. Nevertheless he endeavored to suppress these, and cheerfully submitted to the strict surveillance which was so marked a feature of the government of the school. But when at the age of seventeen he passed to their seminary at Barby with the purpose of fitting himself for their missionary work, his keen intellect and strong will, stimulated by the new surroundings, revolted against the constant iteration of orthodox

<sup>2</sup> *Schleiermachers Glaubenslehre in ihrer Bedeutung für Vergangenheit und Zukunft*. Von Carl Clemen. Bonn: Ricker, 1905. x+132 pages. M. 3.

formulæ and the rigid exclusion of "dangerous" literature. In spite of rules, he studied Lessing, Kant, Herder, Goethe. A long inward struggle issued in the renunciation of the orthodox system—particularly the deity of Christ, vicarious atonement, and everlasting punishment—and the ultimate announcement of his change of mind to his astounded and exasperated father. Securing permission to study without restriction in Halle under the direction of Stubenrauch, his mother's brother, he left the society forever. Here he began a course of omnivorous reading which lasted for years, wrestling bravely with those grave problems which chain the attention of all thoughtful men, and finally triumphing over his unbelief. For though he never re-entered the Moravian society, the vivid religious impressions of his youth renewed their sway over his mind, religion became to him the question of all questions, and, to use his own words, he found himself "a Moravian still, but of a higher order;" for he learned that doctrinal forms are only the clothing of the spirit of religion, which ever seeks new and more adequate forms of self-expression.

Meyer does not trace the outcome of all this in Schleiermacher's later career, for it lies beyond the scope of his essay, but he gives us a careful analysis of Herrnhuterism, which is really the secret of Schleiermacher's power as a preacher and theologian. Herrnhuterism is pietism of the Franciscan type—individualistic, but communion-forming; semi-monastic in organization, but not separatist; a church within the church and a state within the state. The essence of its devotion is the worship of Jesus—i. e., contemplation of his person, participation in his inner experiences, fellowship in his sufferings—and its religious ideal is a communion of love with him in his heavenly exaltation. Accordingly the substance of this religion is not found in doctrine, ritual, or morality, but in feeling—*Gefühl*, *Genuss*—a religion not of the understanding or of the will, but of the heart.

Turning to Clemen's essay, the reviewer must express a feeling of disappointment. For this work, though exhibiting the author's keen analytical skill and wide acquaintance with the ablest German theologians, fails to give us a clear view of Schleiermacher's relations on a broad scale to the great theological movements of modern times. The title of the book would lead one to expect to find in it a survey of the main lines of theological progress since the times of Schleiermacher, and of the general field of theological investigation and speculation in the present, combined with an estimate of the extent to which these great movements of thought have received an impulse from him, and at the same time an indication of the manner in which his principles relate themselves to present-day problems.

We find, instead, a statement of the harmony or disagreement of Schleiermacher's views with those of such thinkers as K. J. Nitsch, Twesten, Rothe, Schweizer, Martensen, Dorner, Biedermann, Lipsius, and A. Ritschl, together with the author's view of the self-consistency of the *Glaubenslehre* and its harmony with truth. We might have hoped also to find some reference to English and American thought; for that same Moravian piety which glowed in Herrnhut, Niesky, and Barby, powerfully affected the religious life of the Anglo Saxon world through the great evangelical revival of the eighteenth century, which was permeated through and through with the Moravian spirit; but the author never looks beyond Germany.

The author's examination of Schleiermacher's system of theology consists, first, of a discussion of his views on questions preliminary to dogmatics proper, namely, the subject-matter of dogmatics, its problem or task; and, second, the main lines of his dogmatics critically examined; third, in conclusion, a summary of the results of the investigation. Instead of restating Schleiermacher's views from a new standpoint, Clemen quite properly takes his position within the system and follows Schleiermacher's own order of exposition. All that can be done in a brief review is to touch on a few of the many questions discussed.

Dogmatics, as Schleiermacher conceives it, is concerned with religion and is pursued in the interests of the church as a religious communion. Nothing, therefore, can be reckoned as dogma that does not spring out of the religious consciousness, no matter what other basis it may possess, for with Schleiermacher religion is in the last analysis a psychological fact. Accordingly, his system of theology is intended to be based upon the essence of religion in general and of Christianity in particular. This Clemen accepts, while he points out that, owing to a prevalent ignorance of the history of religion, Schleiermacher's view of the nature of religion was defective. Piety (personal religion) is described as "a determinateness of the *feeling*." Clemen holds that, while Schleiermacher's view is defensible as against intellectualism and moralism, in this form it is indefensible because it overlooks the *idea* which, though ever so obscure, is always involved in feeling. This defective view of religion works to the detriment of his whole system, which cannot be made to develop out of a religious consciousness which consists in the feeling of absolute dependence. The influence of this conception of the relations between religion and dogma is manifest in the efforts made by the most eminent theologians of later times to arrive at an adequate description of the nature of religion, and of Christianity in particular. The Ritschlian school has labored to prune Schleiermacher's system of its defects; for, while they emphasize the

points of distinction between his views and theirs, Clemen declares: "There is not a single dogmatical idea by which Ritschl is distinguished from his nearest predecessors and contemporaries which was not present in Schleiermacher's system at least in germ; yes, even the most important supplement which Herrmann has made to Ritschl's system is found beforehand in Schleiermacher."

Clemen proceeds to point out the lack of harmony between Schleiermacher's definition of religion and his conception of Christianity as redemptive, the failure to do justice to historical truth in his interpretation of Christianity, and the impossibility of developing a peculiarly Christian dogmatic out of the antithesis of sin and grace within the consciousness. Yet our author finds so many germinal ideas in Schleiermacher manifesting themselves in the speculative systems of succeeding dogmaticians, that he quotes with approval the prophetic saying of Gass in 1822: "With Schleiermacher's *Glaubenslehre* a new epoch in the whole range of theological studies will begin;" and the statement of Bernoulli in 1897: "The history of Protestant dogmatics in the nineteenth century is the history of Schleiermacher's influence."

GEORGE CROSS.

McMASTER UNIVERSITY,  
Toronto, Can.

---

### SOME RECENT BOOKS ON CATHOLIC THEOLOGY

The Roman Catholic religion may be considered as a spiritual force moving men upward and onward to Christ; it may be considered as a theology, representing the adjustment of divine revelation to the growing intellectual needs of mankind; it may be considered as a polity governing the world in things spiritual, and organizing the spiritual forces at its command for the greater glory of Christ.

As a theology the Catholic religion presents today its most interesting, its most instructive side.

Since Leo XIII ascended the papal throne, the zeal for things intellectual has grown apace in Catholic circles. The great encyclical "Aeterni Patris" (1879) sought to bring again into vogue the philosophy of the Schoolmen, and particularly the doctrines of Thomas Aquinas, to the end that Catholic scholars might be able to "give reason for the hope that was in them." The intellectualism which is so marked in Thomas was dominant for a time; then there came a decided tendency to return to the positions advocated by Scotus and his followers. Leo revived interest in sociological science by his letters on "Democracy," "Labor," and kindred